MR. D. S. MALLAPPA.—Is it not a fact that there were no elections at the time these conferences were proposed to be held and that the conference programme had nothing to do with canvassing ?

At this stage, MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR brought to notice that the seating arrangements, though they were better than before, were not satisfactory and that members sitting in the rear rows could not hear or even see the President. He also brought to notice that the loud speaker was not working satisfactorily. He requested that better arrangements in both these respects be made in future.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—BILLS.

I. Statement of General Principles of the Bill further to Amend the Negotiable Instruments Regulation, 1917.

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI) explained the general principles of the Bill as follows :—

"The object of the Bill is to amend the Negotiable Instruments Regulation, 1917, so as to provide that cheques originally drawn to bearer shall not lose their bearer character, notwithstanding any endorsement thereon whether in full or in blank and whether such endorsement purports to restrict or exclude further negotiation or not. The necessity for the amendment has risen out of the view taken that under Section 50 of the Negotiable Instruments Regulation, 1917, and the illustration thereto, a bearer bill can legally be changed to an order bill by endorsement. This makes it incumbent on banks to examine all endorsements upon bearer cheques, and this considerably increases their work and responsibility without any compensatory advantage to their constituents or to the general public.

"The law in British India has been similarly modified by Act XVII of 1934. It is necessary to amend the Mysore Regulation also since it is very desirable that the law in respect of Negotiable Instruments should be uniform in India.

"The Bill is intended to secure the above object.

"The Mysore Bank has also suggested that the amendment is desirable and necessary."

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO, in opposing the amendment, said that certain advantages existing at present were sought to be removed by the proposed amendment. For instance, a cheque, though drawn to bearer at first might by a series of endorsements later on be converted into an order cheque. But the amendment would result in doing away with that facility, because it sought to retain the bearer character. If by some inadvertence a cheque was lost and somebody not entitled to receive the benefit of the cheque were to pick it up, he could cash it by mere presentation at the bank concerned. The speaker did not know why either the drawer or the endorser should suffer merely because the cheque was lost. No doubt, a series of endorsements in each case might result in more work for the bank staff in the shape of scrutiny. To avoid that, some other simplified procedure might have to be adopted. But so far as the present amendment was concerned he was of opinion that, in view of the limited business experience in the country, the existing practice might continue.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) replied that it was better to keep up the character of bearer cheques. If the argument against the amendment was that a bearer cheque, if it was stolen, would cause inconvenience or loss to anybody, the answer to such an argument was that the person should take as much care of it as he would in respect of a currency note.

MR. NARASINGA RAO replied that in respect of legal rights and characteristics, a cheque did not stand on all fours with a currency note. Further, if the main consideration underlying the proposed amendment was that bearer cheques should not lose their bearer character notwithstanding

subsequent endorsements thereon, it might as well be provided that a bearer cheque should invariably be cashed only by the payee concerned.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that a bank's primary concern was to safeguard the interests of its own constituents and it could not be expected to safeguard the interests of anybody and everybody.

MR. NARASINGA RAO observed that so long as a person, whether he was a client of the bank or not, had the liberty to negotiate, the bank ought to take the responsibility of seeing that his interests also were protected.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that it was not proposed to throw such a responsibility on banks.

Dharmapravartha M. L. NAGAPPA SETTY supported the measure. He observed that many inconveniences were felt by the mercantile classes under the existing practice. The law in British India had been changed for the better and the law in Mysore also stood in need of a similar change. Secondly, uniformity of practice was also necessary as between Mysore and the rest of India. Otherwise, many complications would arise in the course of business. Lastly, when banks which had to deal with cheques had themselves suggested a harmless amendment, he did not know why there should be objection to it from the Assembly.

MR. P. SUBBARAMA CHETTY, in opposing the measure, observed that the reason advanced for amending the Bill, *viz.*, to lessen the work entailed upon banks, was not tenable. Even if scrutiny meant additional work, it would not involve any extra expenditure on any bank. And such scrutiny was, after all, a necessary duty of the bank staff. Careful scrutiny was necessary as much in the interests of the safety of the bank itself as in the interests of the parties concerned. And even if such scrutiny entailed extra expenditure, the bank might well incur it. That would be better than doing away with a facility actually existing in regard to mercantile transactions. He was therefore of the opinion that the amendment was unnecessary and that the present practice should continue.

MR K MATTHAN said that if the drawer of a cheque had safeguards in mind, he would naturally draw an order cheque. It was only when he meant to draw a bearer cheque that he would do so. It was not right to interfere with that discretion of the drawer. The recognition of subsequent endorsements on a bearer cheque would amount to an interference with such discretion and this was why the amendment under discussion had been proposed.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA did not agree with the opposers of the measure. He thought that the intention of drawers of bearer cheques should not be disregarded and that their character should remain unaffected throughout. Secondly, the amendment sought to bring about uniformity throughout the country. For these reasons he supported the amendment.

MR. T. MADIAH GOWDA thought that the amendment would make for better business relations and bring better business returns to the State. It was not possible for the staff of any bank to scrutinise each and every endorsement on cheques, and it was desirable to keep bearer cheques as readily cashable instruments. For these reasons he supported the amendment.

MR. BELUR SRINIVASIENGAR said that the Negotiable Instruments Act was introduced in British India so long back as 1881 and an amendment similar to the one now under consideration in Mysore had been passed in British India only in 1934, *i.e.*, 53 years after the introduction of the Act. The Regulation came into force in Mysore only in 1917 and it was too early to say whether a similar amendment was really necessary in the State. It was better to watch for some more time how the Regulation worked in the State as it stood at present.

Secondly, so long as the drawer of a cheque recognised that the amount mentioned in the cheque was due to a particular party, there was no reason why that party should be prevented

from transferring the amount to yet another party. Government themselves were no bankers and as such could not have experienced any great inconvenience for want of the proposed amendment. The speaker was aware that the amendment was suggested to Government as a result of a recently decided case. But that was only a stray instance and there was nothing to warrant the conclusion that the amendment was absolutely necessary. It might be that one particular bank suggested to the Government to propose this amendment. But it was the duty of the Government to safeguard the interests not only of the banks but also of the general public including the payees. Simply because the amendment had been passed in British India, it need not be imitated in Mysore also.

MR. B. C. RANGAPPA supported the amendment.

MR. G. M. CHANDRASEKHAR shared the views expressed by Mr. Belur Srinivasiengar.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR said that it was no doubt true that, like currency notes, cheques also should be enabled to pass freely from hand to hand. But if there was no end to endorsements it would be difficult for banks to go on scrutinizing them. A restriction such as the one proposed would surely become necessary at some stage or other. Besides, banking operations, even of banks within the State, were by no means confined to the limits of the State. In fact, the Bangalore Bank which was situated in the Civil and Military Station had a branch in the City, and the Bank of Mysore, located in the City, had a branch in the Civil and Military Station; and if the procedure differed as between the City and the Cantonment, the existing inconveniences to the clientele of the banks would continue. In western countries it had been agreed that though the administrations differed, negotiable instruments must be regulated by one common law. Following the same wholesome principle, it was desirable for Mysore to accept the amendment and not reject the benefit of experience gained in British India.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR also spoke in favour of the amendment.

At this stage, the general principles of the Bill were put to vote and *passed* by a large majority.

II. Statement of General Principles of the Bill further to Amend the Mysore Limitation Regulation, 1911.

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI) explained the general principles of the Bill as follows :—

"Under Articles 176 and 177 of the First Schedule to the Mysore Limitation Regulation, the time allowed for bringing on record the legal representative of a deceased party in suits and appeals filed under the Code of Civil Procedure is six months from the date of the death of such party. This provision leads to unnecessary delay in the disposal of civil cases. In British India, the period was reduced to 90 days by Act XXVI of 1920, and there is no reason to think that the reduction in the period of limitation has worked to the detriment of the parties. If a similar amendment is made here, one cause of delay in the disposal of cases will be removed. In exceptional cases, a remedy is provided by Order XXII, Rule 9 of the Civil Procedure Code. The High Court have recommended the reduction of the period to 90 days as proposed.

"It is accordingly proposed to amend Articles 176 and 177 of the First Schedule to the Mysore Limitation Regulation, 1911."

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR opposed the amendment. He had no doubt that delays in the disposal of suits should be avoided in all possible ways. But he could not agree to certain necessary conveniences allowed to the litigant public being taken away merely with a view to reduce delays. The time limit now allowed to a party for bringing on record all the legal representatives of a deceased person was 6 months and all that period was actually necessary, considering the backward state of the villages and the absence of communications. It might

be that in a particular case the legal representatives were many and lived in different and far off places. The person whose responsibility it was to ascertain all their addresses could not possibly do so within 3 months as proposed.

MR. J. MAHOMED IMAM however thought that 3 months was more than ample for bringing on record the legal representatives of a deceased party and for this reason supported the amendment.

MR. H. R. GURUVA REDDY said that plaintiffs would generally be anxious to get the cases decreed in their favour and would generally be prepared with information relating to the legal representatives of a deceased party. If at all, the difficulty complained of by Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar was to some extent real only in the case of defendants. But even in their case, if 3 months were not enough, the courts had an inherent power under the Civil Procedure Code to extend the time. In fact he thought that even 3 months as proposed under the amendment were not necessary in a majority of cases. With these words he supported the amendment.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO did not agree to the proposed amendment. He was aware of a number of cases in which the plaintiffs themselves died, leaving behind only minor children who were not even aware that their father was conducting such and such a case. It would be a great hardship to such minor children if some one on their behalf was expected to bring the legal heirs on record within 3 months. The period of 6 months now allowed was really necessary in all such cases.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH was not convinced that any plaintiff would delay furnishing information to the court since he would naturally be anxious to get his own case disposed of quickly. The speaker would have been glad if the High Court had shown how the existing provision of law led to delays and how the proposed amendment would reduce them.

MR. T. MARIAPPA did not see why this amendment should be passed in Mysore simply because it had been passed in British India. As regards avoidance of delays, he did not know how the object could be gained by merely reducing the period from 6 to 3 months. The reasons for laws delays, in his opinion, lay elsewhere and it was up to the High Court to investigate them and apply better remedies than the amendment under discussion.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA and *Khan Bahadur* MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN agreed in the above view and added that, under the present backward state of education in rural parts, the litigant public would not be able to act quickly and do all that was necessary within the period of 3 months. They therefore opposed the amendment.

MR. T. MADIAH GOWDA brought to notice that the Limitation Act had been amended in several respects in British India. Some of those amendments were more urgently required in Mysore than the amendment under discussion. It would be well for Mysore to think of introducing those amendments first.

As regards Section 178, there were differences of opinion, even among the British Indian courts themselves, as to whether the time allowed was 3 months or 6 months It had still remained a matter for interpretation and each court went on interpreting the Section in its own way. He therefore thought that in this essential respect the High Court of Mysore should clarify the position and then think of the amendment in question, if necessary.

In the next place, he also repeated that in the present backward state of education among villagers and more especially in view of want of adequate postal facilities and communications, it was difficult for the litigant public living in rural parts to know the various stages of progress of any case and take prompt action in matters governed by the provisions under discussion. In fact he thought that even 6 months' time was sometimes not enough for a party to bring on record all the legal representatives of a deceased person. Of course he was aware that Order XXII, Rule 9 of the Civil Procedure Code, provided for extension of time in special cases. But it might not be

expected that in every case the court would grant an extension. For these reasons he was for the existing provision to continue.

MR. B. L. BYANNA however supported the amendment for the reason that 90 days would be quite ample for the purpose in view.

MR. K. SRINIVASIAH said that it was difficult to believe that by reducing the time from 6 to 3 months for the particular purpose mentioned in the statement, delays in the final disposal of cases would be avoided. The benefit of Order XXII, Rule 9, was not being freely given by courts of law, and he was aware that many petitions in this behalf had been summarily dismissed. For this reason he opposed the amendment.

MESSRS. TUDKI RAMANNA GOWDA and M. SUBBIAH also expressed the same view.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) at this stage explained that the object of the amendment was to help the litigant public and not to lighten the work of the courts. Nor was it the intention to adopt the amendment merely because it had been passed in British India. If that were so, it would have been proposed here soon after it was passed in British India, *i.e.*, 15 years ago. The High Court of Mysore thought that this amendment would bring about an improvement and that was why Government had brought up the Bill. He was of the opinion that the position would not differ very much whether the time allowed was 6 months or 3 months because in any case the concerned party would stir himself to activity only as the time allowed was nearing expiry. But if, as was brought to notice, there was real hardship in exceptional cases, the court could grant the full benefit of Order XXII, Rule 9.

Dharmapravartha M. L. NAGAPPA SETTY, interrupting, said that the amendment would result in considerable hardship to women and minor plaintiffs or defendants if they had to bring on record the legal representatives of a deceased party within 3 months. It would have been much better if the High Court had suggested other and more effective ways of avoiding delays. So he requested the Government not to pass the amendment.

MR. K. MATTHAN, continuing, said that other ways of avoiding delays would also be explored, but that would have to be done separately. It was for the people who were complaining of laws delays to co-operate with the High Court when they proposed this as one of the ways of avoiding delays.

The general principles of the Bill were at this stage put to vote but *lost.*

The House then adjourned for lunch and reassembled at 3-50 p.m.

As soon as the House reassembled, *Khan Bahadur* MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN stated that the Mussalman members of the House would be thankful for a holiday on Friday, 14th June 1935, since they would not be in a position to attend the Assembly on account of the Birthday of the Holy Prophet.

THE DEWAN replied that the members referred to need not attend the Assembly on that day.

III. Statement of General Principles of the Bill further to Amend the Code of Criminal Procedure.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN) explained the general principles of the Bill as follows :—

"Under Section 367 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, every judgment has to be written by the presiding officer of the court.

"The High Court have recommended that the Code of Criminal Procedure be amended so as to allow dictation of judgments by Judges not lower in rank than Assistant Sessions Judges and also by Magistrates specially empowered. This will assist the Judges and Magistrates concerned in their work, and enable them to dispose of cases more promptly.

"In British India, Section 367 of the Code of Criminal Procedure was amended in 1923, giving power to all presiding officers to dictate judgments. Power has been taken under the Mysore

Civil Procedure Code to empower the presiding officers of Civil Courts to pronounce judgments by dictation. The system has proved to be a convenient arrangement, and is working satisfactorily.

"It is proposed to amend Section 367 of our Code, restricting the power only to officers specially empowered in that behalf."

The general principles of the Bill were *accepted* by the House without discussion.

IV. Statement of General Principles of the Bill to further Amend the Mysore Forest Regulation, 1900.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN) explained the general principles of the Bill as follows :—

"While under Section 75 of the Mysore Forest Regulation the sale or attempt to sell sandalwood is prohibited, no penalty is prescribed for breach of the provisions of this Section. Further the Regulation does not define the scope of the term 'sandalwood.'

"Instances have come to the notice of Government in which no action could be taken against private persons possessing sandalwood saw-dust for purposes of sale as no penalty is prescribed under Section 75 of the Regulation and sandalwood 'saw-dust' is not included in the term 'sandalwood.' It is therefore considered expedient to amend the said section by providing a penalty for contravention of the provisions of the said section and define the term sandalwood so as to include roots, billets, pieces, sawn or otherwise, chips and saw-dust (whether containing heartwood or not) of sandalwood, but not sandal wood carved or otherwise manufactured.

"The Bill is intended to amend the Regulation accordingly."

MR. M. SUBBAIYA stated that there were several poor people who purchased sandal chips and made their living by selling the powder made out of them. The proposed amendment would mean a great hardship to such people.

THE CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS (MR. B. V. RAMIENGAR) pointed out that there could be no objection to the sale of dust even in future. Only, it would have to be done after obtaining a license therefor. The term 'sandalwood' had not been clearly defined in the Regulation and the object of the proposed amendment was to enlarge the definition.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA observed that sandal dust was necessary for domestic purposes like worship, and both Hindus and Mussalmans needed it. The Forest Department itself made no use of the dust and the amendment only sought to impose an unnecessary restriction on the liberties of people.

MR. L. VEMA REDDY agreed that there should be provision in the Regulation for awarding punishments for breaches of rules and that the amendment proposed was therefore perfectly in order.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH stated that people in the villages required sandal dust very often in connection with marriages and other religious functions in small quantities and it would be unnecessary to insist on their obtaining licenses to possess or purchase it. He suggested that petty merchants should be permitted to sell sandal dust in small quantities without having to obtain licenses.

MESSRS. M. S. PUTTARAMA SETTY, MIR MAHOMED SAHIB and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA were also of this opinion.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA also agreed in this view. He added that the Forest Department would remove all valuable wood in the first instance, and the villagers would remove the heartwood only from the rejected logs and prepare sandal dust out of such wood. He did not see any necessity for preventing anybody from making or using such dust.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) pointed out that under the Regulation, all sandalwood was the exclusive property of the Government and could not be interfered with by others in any manner for any purpose. The amendment was for providing penalties in case of unauthorised sale of sandalwood

which included sandal dust also. As for anybody selling or using limited quantities of sandal dust, he observed that there could be no trouble as licenses could easily be obtained even without the payment of any fee.

MR. H. K. MADIAH spoke in favour of the amendment as sandal trees were Government property and required to be specially taken care of.

MR. J. MAHOMED IMAM however did not support the amendment. He wanted that young plants and trees of stunted growth should be exempted from the operation of the rules.

MR. GURUSWAMI GOWDA stated that there were many people who had engaged themselves solely in the business of manufacturing amber sticks, etc., and used sandal dust in large quantities. If there was no provision in law for punishment in the case of unauthorised removal of wood, it was likely that such people would remove wood. To prevent them from doing so, the amendment was very necessary.

MR. PUTTASWAMI GOWDA said that though he was not opposed to the amendment, it must be made clear that the law as amended should not be enforced too strictly. Even without the amendment, the law was stringent enough and sometimes innocent parties were being subjected to various hardships for alleged removal of sandal trees.

MR. T. MARIAPPA enquired whether any defects had been found in the working of the present Regulation, necessitating the proposed amendment.

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN replied in the affirmative and added that Government had been legally advised to get the law amended as proposed.

MR. T. MARIAPPA pointed out that, if the definition of the term 'sandalwood' was enlarged so as to include roots, billets and pieces, etc., it would work as a great hardship to the people. If a person was found to be in possession of even a small piece of wood, he would be liable to punishment under such a law.

MR. K. MATTHAN remarked that, even under the proposed amendment, no license would become necessary for possession of wood up to 5 lbs. Over and above that, a person could possess any quantity after obtaining a license. Till now, in the Regulation itself, the term 'sandalwood' had not been defined and the definition as contained in the Transit Rules was not considered adequate for the purpose in view. The amendment would not lead to any hardship in actual working and there was no reason why any member of the Assembly should entertain misgivings in this respect.

The general principles of the Bill were then put to vote and *passed* unanimously.

V. Statement of General Principles of the Bill to Amend the Cinematograph Regulation, 1923.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN) explained the general principles of the Bill as follows:—

"Under the provisions of the Cinematograph Regulation, 1923, all films intended for public exhibition in Mysore are subject to censorship. The censorship is, however, confined to the film itself and does not extend to the manner of advertising the film which is often more objectionable than the film advertised. This exhibition of indecent or otherwise objectionable film posters in public places has come to the notice of the Government and the desirability of taking action to bring these posters under control has been urged upon the attention of Government by associations for social welfare and the suggestion has been made that the Regulation should be amended so as to provide for the censorship of all pictorial representations intended for use as advertising matter in connection with cinematograph films. The Bill is intended to provide for such censorship."

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO pointed out that there was already provision in the Police Regulation for taking action against the exhibition of indecent pictures and, as such, there was no necessity for insisting on all the posters being censored. Moreover, the posters were not printed locally. Usually, the

importers of films got the posters along with the films and the posters would have already been subjected to censorship along with the films at the place of production. Some of the cinema-owners had explained to him that subjecting all the advertisements also to censorship would mean very great inconvenience to them due to loss of time and that the posters ought to be allowed in business interests to be used immediately on receipt from the suppliers. Again, if a particular poster was ordered not to be exhibited, the advertisement would suffer for want of continuity of incidents, and the cinema proprietors might have just ground for complaint. Perhaps all the difficulties of the proprietors could better be known by the Government if some of them were consulted before any further action was taken in the matter.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH enquired whether there were any cases of indecent posters being actually exhibited in the State.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) replied in the affirmative.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO remarked that posters permitted in western countries were much more indecent than those that were ordinarily imported into India.

THE DEWAN however thought that what applied to the film must also apply to the posters concerning it.

MR. K. MATTHAN observed that sometimes the posters appeared to be more indecent than the films themselves. He also added that Administrations elsewhere had taken power to censor posters and that was all that was sought to be done in Mysore under the amendment proposed.

The general principles of the Bill were then put to vote and *passed* by the House.

REPRESENTATIONS.

REPRESENTATION NO. 1.

Withdrawing of the Government Order regarding extension of service of superannuated officers up to 57 years.

MESSRS. D. S. MALLAPPA and SHIVABASAPPA, Tiptur Taluk; G. K. MALLAPPA, Tiptur Municipality; SINGRI NANJAPPA, Minorities and REVANNA GOWDA, Kunigal Taluk.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA represented that it was inadvisable to give extension of service to non-gazetted officers after they attained 55 years of age. Somehow or other, officials would try to win the favour of their superior officers and get extensions. Very few after 55 years of age were fit for work. Of course, medical certificates were insisted upon, but the officials would somehow manage to get them also. The Government Order in the matter was likely to lead to inefficiency of service. Further, it would prevent educated young men from getting into service. The order had been passed as a measure of economy, but now that the finances of the State had improved—so much so that salary cuts were proposed to be discontinued—it was time that the order was rescinded.

MR. MEER MAHOMED SAHIB was of opinion that there was no harm in retaining the Government Order, as the discretion to grant extensions rested with the Government. It would be a great loss to the State if efficient men were retired merely on the ground that they attained 55 years of age.

MR. B. L. BYANNA said that, if the order was not withdrawn, every official would try to get extension for 2 years. Extensions might be granted in exceptional cases, if the concerned officials were men with special abilities; but there should be no general rule in that behalf.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH was of opinion that officials would not be competent to discharge their duties properly after they attained 55 years of age. They would take no interest in Government work and it would be undesirable to give them any extension. If that was done, it would not only prevent young men from getting into service but also deny the officials themselves the rest which they so much deserved.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA was also of opinion that extensions should not be granted. If officials were retired as soon as they attained the age of superannuation, they were likely to settle down in the villages and be of some use to the villagers. If they were

enabled to do so, the villages would improve and the country as a whole would be so much the better for it in course of time.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. S. SHAMANNA) explained that the points referred to in the course of the discussions were three, *viz.*, efficiency, economy and scope for employment of unemployed men. They had all been taken into consideration before the order under reference was passed. The question of efficiency was one that had best be left to the discretion of Government as they were as keen about it as any one else. There was also no doubt that grant of extensions in all deserving cases would result in reduced expenditure under pensions and salaries. As regards scope for employment of more men, that question remained affected by the grant of extensions as the total number employed remained the same and scope for employment would increase only if more appointments were created.

MR. H. K. MADIAH stated that economy should not be the sole consideration. There should be better opportunities for educated young men to enter Government service. That would be possible only if officials were retired soon after they attained 55 years of age.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR was also of opinion that all superannuated men should promptly be retired. The officials would have already served for a long period of 30 years and would very much prefer a change of life, engaging themselves in the cause of the country, as non-officials.

MR. TUDKI RAMANNA GOWDA also supported the representation.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) observed that the order had been passed only as a temporary measure.

THE DEWAN added that the order would be withdrawn if it was found that, as a consequence of it, efficiency of the services had suffered.

At this stage, the Assembly rose for the day, to meet again at 12 of the clock the next day.

SECOND DAY.

Friday, 14th June 1935.

The House reassembled at 12 of the clock *Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. Matthan, First Member of Council, presiding.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—(*contd.*)

Drafting of Officers to the Amildari Service.

MESSRS. H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH (Malvalli Taluk); SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH (Mysore Taluk); T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk); S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA (Krishnarajpet Taluk); C. DASAPPA (Heggadadevankote Taluk); GURUBASAPPA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); MIR RAZA ALI (Minorities); B. S. PUTTASWAMY (Nanjangud Taluk); H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA (T.-Narsipur Taluk); H. HONNAIYA and M. L. LINGANNA (Mandya Taluk); PATEL SANNA MALLAPPA (Yelandur Jahgir); K. KEMPE GOWDA (Mandya Municipality); A. THAMMAYYA (Minorities); B. SIDDALINGA SETTY (Special Interests) and S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk).—

Q.—10. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) How many officers were drafted from the Education Department as Deputy Amildars and Amildars since the last Dasara Session ?

(*b*) What are the particulars of (i) caste, (ii) qualification, (iii) service, and (iv) age of such officers ?

(*c*) Was it not stated during the last Dasara Session that no one from the Education Department would be included in the Amildari list ?

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI).—

A. (*a*) Two. One as Amildar and another as Deputy Amildar.